

JUL 13 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>BALKAR SINGH,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>
--

No. 07-74056

Agency No. A076-862-032

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 29, 2010**

Before: ALARCÓN, LEAVY, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Balkar Singh, a native and citizen of India, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order denying his second motion to reopen. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for abuse of discretion,

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Najmabadi v. Holder, 597 F.3d 983, 986 (9th Cir. 2010), and we deny the petition for review.

The BIA did not abuse its discretion by denying Singh’s motion to reopen as untimely where the motion was filed more than 90 days after the BIA’s final order, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2), and Singh failed to establish changed country conditions in India to qualify for the regulatory exception to the time limitation, *see* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(3)(ii); *see also Malty v. Ashcroft*, 381 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2004) (“The critical question is . . . whether circumstances have changed sufficiently that a petitioner who previously did not have a legitimate claim for asylum now has a well-founded fear of future persecution.”).

Singh’s contention that the BIA failed to provide a reasoned explanation for its denial is belied by the record.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.